

Book Reviews

***Trevor Colbourn,
Editor***

Martin J. Finkelstein, Robert K. Seal, and Jack H. Schuster. *The New Academic Generation* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998). 208 pp. \$32.50 hardcover.

The nature of the education offered at college and universities at the end of the twentieth and at the beginning of the twenty-first centuries is obviously important.

Finkelstein, Seal, and Schuster sought to examine the characteristics of those who seek to provide educational opportunities in higher education. Data were collected from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty survey, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement. The sample for this study included 514,976 individuals who had full-time faculty status, with primary responsibilities in teaching and research, and with seven years or less in a full-time faculty position.

The authors provide a plethora of information from their research. The data and discussions are reported in detailed, scholarly style. Included are the introduction, rationale for the study, literature review, scope of the inquiry, procedures, findings, summary, and conclusions, with appendices of tables, the survey instrument, notes, and references. The observations are articulately described with helpful charts and tables to support the discussion.

This comprehensive research was conducted and reported with scholarly rigor. The data are presented objectively, with pragmatic rationales adding insight for the findings. The report includes information about the academicians working in selected institutions and academic program areas on age, academic rank, gender, race/ethnicity, citizenship, parents' educational levels, and approximately thirty additional variables.

The multiple discussions and detailed analysis far exceed the scope of this review; however, selected data may be useful for the reader. For example, one-third of the full-time core faculty at colleges and universities are new entrants, and the majority of new-generation faculty members teach in colleges outside the liberal arts.

The proportion of men in the new cohorts who have attained the rank of full professor is more than three times that among women; and yet, remarkable gains have been made by women in obtaining faculty positions: nearly 40.8 percent of the new-generation faculty are women.

Cultural implications suggest that the growth in the number of non-Caucasian faculty has risen from 11.7 percent minority faculty among the senior cohort to 17 percent among new entrants.

Not only was the new generation of faculty hired into their current positions about eight years after completing their degrees, compared with four years for senior faculty members, but the new generation of faculty is also less likely to be tenured.

A different writing style seems to emerge with Chapter Five, causing the reader to adjust to a different flow of text, albeit the change is not dramatic—similar to a shift of tonality in music from the key of G major to B major without a modulation. In this section it is noted that tenured women faculty teach considerably more than men and prefer spending more time than men performing service activities. In addition, the report indicates that both men and women would rather spend more time in research than in teaching.

In conclusion, the authors have assimilated data that reflect scholarly rigor, organized in meaningful ways. These data are useful resources for those interested in demographic and academic characteristics, as well as in opinions of educators. Such a comprehensive volume is clearly an important contribution to the documentation of the historical evolution and trends among academicians in institutions of higher education.

—Sharon H. Nelson

Nigel Blake, Richard Smith, and Paul Standish, *The Universities We Need: Higher Education after Dearing* (London: Kogan Page Publishers, 1998). 192 pp. \$28.00.

This is an iconoclastic but essentially very serious critique of the economic instrumentality of the Dearing Report, and it raises important contextual questions as to why the universities' response has been so muted to what have been the main rhetorical drivers of the higher education system over the period of the gestation of the report and its aftermath. It is a reflection, I suppose, of the extent to which we have become acculturated to the language of relevance, quality, and strategic managements that one derives an almost guilty pleasure from reading an analysis of its ambiguities and contradictions and its essentially utilitarian subtext. One can reasonably argue that the authors have not altogether taken on board the imperatives of the UK's late 1980s conversion to mass higher education and that a comparable U. S. book would have read very differently, putting the needs of a mixed student clientele much higher up its agenda. But this work is a valuable challenge to the current UK consensus and ought to stimulate debate. It is engagingly written and should be regarded as having a kind of *samizdat* quality, demanding that you pass it on to a friend.

The authors' approach is to quote the kinds of phrases or ideas that have become the commonplace of higher education debate and unpick them. Thus they question the concept of "stakeholders," arguing that neither students, nor industry, nor even the state fulfill the criteria to be a stakeholder in British higher education. They argue that an emphasis on procedural values is undermining the teaching relationship, and they seek to define degree courses more from the standpoint of their transformational function than from any direct measurement of performance by the teachers. They are particularly critical of the growing elision, as they see it, between education and training, and they reflect on the extent to which the report's approach to this and related topics was based on unexamined reliance on popular, journalistic, management thinking about globalization and the needs of the economy. In the same vein, they argue cogently for more emphasis to be given to exposing students to more intellectual ideas

and critical thinking. They quote Oakeshott's description of the scholar as "the delegated intellect" and suggest that Dearing is "benignly tolerant" of this role but that his acceptance of it is a form of tokenism that hides a much more narrowly vocational and instrumental attitude to university education.

This brief account of some of these arguments might suggest that the authors are prone to look backward rather than forward, but this would not do justice to the strength of the ideas. There is, it is true, a hankering after teaching as a two-way dialogue that is perhaps a characteristic of more favorable student-staff ratios than we have now, but the essence of the authors' approach is more to raise questions about the underlying effectiveness of much of the rhetoric than to deny the realities of the present environment.

In one sense, I think, the book sets up the Dearing Report as a straw man in that it is inevitable that such a document must be written politically to persuade a reluctant Treasury to invest resources rather than reduce them; it is partly a selling document, not a statement of pure principle. Nevertheless, the authors deserve our thanks for reminding us that *idees reçues* recycled as unassailable fact require critical scrutiny or they will provide inadequate foundations for future policy.

—Michael Shattock

Judith Glazer-Raymo, *Shattering the Myths, Women in Academe* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999). 200 pp. \$38.00 hardcover.

Judith Glazer-Raymo's book is a compelling resource for anyone who might have a notion that women in academe have achieved equality. In fact, Glazer-Raymo sets out to debunk a myth that is probably not widely held. Furthermore, she offers no documented claims of individuals who believe women have achieved parity; she does not even suggest who might believe the myths. Nevertheless, the title does command one's attention.

She does provide an excellent statistical update on women's national availability in a vast array of disciplines and on women's ranks and salaries within the professorate. The reference value of these tabular data is, perhaps, the most significant contribution of her book.

In addition to the compendium of data, she focuses on the activism of the 1970s, the decline in activism of the 1980s, and the virtual negativism toward feminism in the 1990s. Glazer-Raymo looks at these stages in conjunction with social, political, and economic forces that shaped beliefs during these periods.

The author makes a strong argument for leveling the playing field with respect to tenure and salaries. She contends that women fare better only in obtaining entry-level positions, while tenure and salary equity elude them. She even claims that political attacks on tenured faculty have "taken a more ominous turn in the past five years" and have polarized higher education.

She places the tenure issue in a broader context than merely discussing the disparity between women and men. For example, she includes a section titled "Tenure Under Scrutiny" that summarizes the view of tenure critics such as Richard Chait. She also

presents recent legal cases that have implications for this highly coveted form of employment security that women have greater difficulty achieving.

In addition to discussing the stratification between women and men in higher education, Glazer-Raymo writes about the politics of leadership, and takes a cynical view of women's ability to break through the glass ceiling. She cites the struggles of women in the 1970s and 1980s to gain promotion. She says that women experienced tokenism and were perceived as objectified personifications of role models, which included the expectation that as managers they would live up to accepted images of womanhood. Her summary of recent laws and organizations established to implement change is comprehensive—including Title VII and IX, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, the EEOC, Commission on the Status of Women, American Council on Education's Commission on Women in Higher Education, state-mandated commissions, and voluntary consortial commissions. She points out that the commissions have assumed the functions of clarifying issues, setting priorities, collecting data, making recommendations, monitoring activities, and serving as sounding boards and early warning systems. Although she provides an impressive commentary on the strategies of various organizations to promote women's equity, she concludes from her analyses that, after three decades of affirmative action and equal opportunity, women are still thwarted in most attempts to attain their goals at every level of the educational and professional hierarchy.

—Carol D. Surles